

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Epizoanthus* Gray, 1867 (Cnidaria, Anthozoa)

(Case 2750; see BZN 48: 19–21)

Mark J. Grygier

Seto Marine Biological Laboratory, Kyoto University, Shirahama, Nishimuro, Wakayama 649–22, Japan

Ordinarily I would hesitate to set aside the principle of priority when such generally obscure animals as zoanthideans are involved. Furthermore, there have been so few taxonomic works published about zoanthideans in the last 50 years that a statement about the lack of use of the generic name *Sidisia* may not be very meaningful. However, on balance, I come out in favor of conserving the generic name *Epizoanthus* Gray, 1867 on the grounds that a name change may lead to confusion in the field of marine parasitology. The ascothoracidan crustacean family LAURIDAE are obligate parasites of zoanthideans and two species, *Laura dorsalis* Grygier, 1985 and *Zoanthoecus scrobisaccus* Grygier, 1990, have been described as parasites of *Epizoanthus* sp. and *Epizoanthus fatuus* (M. Schultze) respectively. I would be disappointed to see the hosts' names change on purely nomenclatural rather than taxonomic grounds.

Additional references

- Grygier, M.J. 1985. Lauridae: taxonomy and morphology of ascothoracid crustacean parasites of zoanthids. *Bulletin of Marine Science*, **36**: 278–303.
Grygier, M.J. 1990. Five new species of bathyal Atlantic Ascothoracida (Crustacea: Maxillopoda) from the Equator to 50°N latitude. *Bulletin of Marine Science*, **46**: 655–676.

Comments on the proposed confirmation of a lectotype for *Lindholmiola barbata* (Férussac, 1821 or 1832) (Mollusca, Gastropoda)

(Case 2630; see BZN 47: 101; 48: 53)

(1) Dietrich Kadolsky

Meadowcroft, 54 Ewell Downs Road, Ewell, Surrey KT17 3BN, U.K.

Commenting on my application, Gittenberger (BZN 48: 53) attempts to provide additional support for the assertion made by Gittenberger & Groh (1986) that *Helix* (*Helicigona*) *barbata* is an available name from Férussac (1821) rather than a nomen nudum and, accordingly, he requests the appropriate date changes in the application.

Contrary to the statement that in Férussac's (1821) work 'Greek letters were not used simply to indicate variants of an undescribed 'normal form' of a species', nearly all usages of Greek letters in the work can easily and consistently be interpreted to denote variants. The only exception is the parallel use of Greek lettering to denote monstrosities, which is expressly so stated in Férussac's work. In fact, many of the Greek letters would be difficult to explain otherwise. This includes Gittenberger's example of species no. 288, *Helix* (*Helicella*) *cretica*, for the words of the supposed description 'Alba, immaculata' can also be found under the preceding species, no. 287, *H. (H.) subrostrata*, here also preceded by the letter α. It is clear that in this case colour

variants of two different species are described with the same words, but the two species themselves are not described.

Férussac did not use the term 'var' in his (1821) work, but he did on labels in his collection in the case of '*Helicigona barbata* var β) Brunnea', as mentioned by Gittenberger & Groh (1986) and myself (BZN 47: 102).

Gittenberger & Groh's (1986) error referred to by me concerns only the inclusion in their list of syntype material of several lots of specimens of *Lindholmiola lens* which were not included in the 1821 or 1832 publications of the names *barbata* or *lens* respectively. A further error was that the term ' β) Brunnea' was considered by them to be part of the original diagnosis of *Lindholmiola barbata* and yet was listed simultaneously as the name of a variety on a label of one lot of 'syntypes' of *L. lens*.

I accept that Gittenberger's new view, that *barbata* α (1821) and *barbata* var. α (1832) are both *Lindholmiola barbata* from Kolpos Soudhas ('La Sude'), is possibly true. In this case the diagnosis of *barbata* α ('minus depressa') has to be taken to mean 'smaller and depressed' instead of 'less depressed' (i.e. the opposite of what I (BZN 47: 102) assumed). However, this does not alter the nomenclatural situation.

The question whether acceptance of the interpretation of Férussac (1821) proposed above upsets the stability of nomenclature in other cases should not be considered and has no bearing on this case. It may well be that additional applications to the Commission are required in connection with Férussac's other names; in the long run stability will best be served by a consistent application of the Code to problematical works.

The Commission could rule that *barbata* is available from 1821 instead of 1832, but such a ruling would require the use of the plenary powers to suspend Articles 12a and 72b(i). No advantage would be gained by this additional ruling and I therefore wish to retain my original application.

(2) Anthea Gentry

Secretariat, International Commission on Zoological Commission

In Opinion 336 (March 1955) *Helix lens* Férussac was ruled to be available from 1832, when the species was figured (pl. 66*, fig. 2), and not from 1821, when it was a nomen nudum. The date for pl. 66* followed that given by Kennard (1942, p. 110), and the name was included on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology as '*lens* Férussac [1832]'.

The proposal to place *Helix lens* Férussac, 1832 on the Official List (BZN 47: 103, para. 8) is therefore withdrawn from the present application.

Comments on the proposed confirmation of unavailability of the name *Fusus Helbling*, 1779 (Mollusca, Gastropoda)

(Case 2729; see BZN 48: 92–96)

(1) L.B. Holthuis

Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

I do not agree with the authors of this application that *Fusus Helbling*, 1779 is not a subgeneric name. All the arguments provided in favour of considering *Fusus* a